

Contextual ShAnkar BhAshya

युष्मदस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरयोर्विषयविषयिणोस्तमःप्रकाशवद्विरुद्धस्वभावयोरितरेतरभावानुपपत्तौ सिद्धायाम् , तद्धर्माणामपि सुतरामितरेतरभावानुपपत्तिः — इत्यतः अस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरे विषयिणि चिदात्मके युष्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरस्य विषयस्य तद्धर्माणां चाध्यासः तद्विपर्ययेण विषयिणस्तद्धर्माणां च विषयेऽध्यासो मिथ्येति भवितुं युक्तम् । तथाप्यन्योन्यस्मिन्नन्योन्यात्मकतामन्योन्यधर्माश्चाध्यस्येतेतराविवेकेन अत्यन्तविविक्तयोर्धर्मधर्मिणोः मिथ्याज्ञाननिमित्तः सत्यानृते मिथुनीकृत्य 'अहमिदम्' 'ममेदम्' इति नैसर्गिकोऽयं लोकव्यवहारः ॥

PanchapAdikAprasthAnam by SSSS (Section 8-9)

८. अथ दार्ष्टान्तिके चिदचितोर्विरुद्धस्वभावत्वं कथं प्रसाधितम् इत्येतच्चिन्तनीयम्। तत्र भाष्यम् (१) युष्मदस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरयोः इति (२) विषयविषयिणोः इति च विशेषणद्वयं साभिप्रायमादत्ते इति व्यक्तम्। तत्र विषयी अस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरः, विषयस्तु युष्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरः, प्रत्ययोश्चनयोः प्रत्यक्पराग्विषयत्वेन विरुद्धस्वभावपदार्थकर्मकत्वमिति यथाश्रुतार्थः स्फुरति; चिद्वस्तु विषयि, अचित्तु विषयात्मकं किञ्चित् - इति च। अत्र यथा तमः-प्रकाशौ विरुद्धस्वभावौ लोके दृष्टौ, एवं विषयविषयिणावित्याशयो गम्यते प्रथमविशेषणेन। न हि अस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरत्वस्वभावकं वस्तु जातुचित्, युष्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरत्वस्वभावकं भवेदिति शक्यशङ्कम् इति, अतः विषयिणि विषयत्वाध्यासः, विषये च विषयित्वाध्यासः नैव संभावित इति तयोः स्वभाववैपरीत्यगमनेन लोको व्यवहरतीति न युक्तिमदिदं वचः - इत्यर्थो भाष्यस्यावसीयते।

Here, it should be deliberated as to how the contradictory nature of chit and non-chit is displayed in the example. The bhAshya purposefully uses the twin adjectives of yushmat-pratyaya-gochara (**YPG**), asmat-pratyaya-gochara (**APG**) and vishaya-vishayI. There, vishayI is APG and vishaya is YPG. As is generally understood from hearing, these two pratyaya have inner and outer vishaya and accordingly have objects with contradictory nature. This meaning manifests (from hearing APG and YPG). Here, vishayI is chit and non-chit is some vishaya. Here, just as light and darkness are seen in the world as having contradictory nature, similarly vishaya and vishayI are also of contradictory nature. This meaning comes across from the first adjective. An object with APG-hood cannot be an object with YPG-hood, therefore, adhyAsa of vishaya-tva in vishayI and that

of vishayI-tva in vishaya is not possible. The transaction in loka is not logical due to the contradictory nature of the two (APG and YPG) - this meaning of bhAshya is decided.

किं नाम अस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरत्वं विषयिणः

(What exactly is the APG-hood of vishayI)

९. तदेतावदेव वाक्यशेषेऽपि स्फुटितमुपलभ्यते भाष्ये - ‘अस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरे विषयिणि चिदात्मके युष्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरस्य विषयस्य तद्वर्माणां चाध्यासः तद्विपर्ययेण विषयिणस्तद्वर्माणां च विषयेऽध्यासो मिथ्येति भवितुं युक्तम्’ इति। अत्र ‘युष्मदस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरयोः’ इति, ‘अस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरे विषयिणि’ इति चाभ्यासेन द्विरुक्तम् ‘अस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरत्वम्’ कीदृशम्? - इति विचिन्त्यम्। अत्र पञ्चपादिका -

“अस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरे योऽनिदमंशश्चिदेकरसः, तस्मिन्, तद्वलनिर्भासिततया लक्षणतो युष्मदर्थस्य मनुष्याभिमानस्य सम्भेद इवावभासः, स एवाध्यासः,..... स मिथ्या इति भवितुं युक्तम्” इति।

अत्र ‘अस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरत्वात् युष्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरत्वाच्च’ इति यदेवाश्रित्य चिदचितोर्विरुद्धस्वभावकत्वमुक्तं प्रथमवाक्ये, तदेव ‘इत्यतः’ इति हेतूकृत्य अध्यासो मिथ्येति भवितुमर्हतीत्युच्यते इति तावदभ्युपगन्तव्यम्; अन्यथा अन्यदेव हेतुत्वेन प्रतिज्ञातम्, अन्यदेव तूक्तम् अभीष्टसाधनवेलायाम् इति वैरूप्यमापद्येतेति। अथ च टीकाकृदयम् ‘अस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरे’ इत्यस्य व्याख्यानावसरे अस्मत्प्रत्यये योऽनिदमंशश्चिदेकरसः तमेव गृहीतवान्, न तु प्रत्ययगोचरमपि इति स्फुटं भाष्यव्याख्यानयोरनानुरूप्यम्।

That only is available in bhAshya (B)- Therefore, it is logical for the adhyAsa - of YPG, which is vishaya, and of its dharma in the APG, which is vishayI & chit-Atmak **AND** opposite thereto, the adhyAsa of vishayI and its dharma into vishaya is mithyA - to be mithyA. Here, it should be deliberated as to what exactly is APG-hood which is spoken twice. Here says PanchapAdikA (P) -

In the APG, there is ‘non-this’ part which is homogeneous. consciousness. In that non-this, there is the appearance of confluence, as it were, of yushmat-object, the human-ego which is illumined by the very same non-this. That alone is adhyAsa. It is logical for that to be mithyA.

Here, in the first sentence of B, the contradictory nature of chit and non-chit was stated relying upon the APG-hood and YPG-hood respectively. Relying upon that only, it should be accepted that the mithyA-tva of adhyAsa is

accepted. Otherwise, there will arise the disharmonious contingency that pratijñā is due to another reason and the conclusion is arrived at by another reason. Therefore, from the fact that - while explaining 'APG', P has taken only the 'non-this' portion which is homogenous-chit and not pratyaya-gochara also - it is clear that there is no conformity of P with B.

Resolution

The central objection of **SSSS** is regarding replacement of APG in adhyāsa by Chit and not taking into account the pratyaya-gochara part. And the objection is on account of the usage of words 'ityatah' by **B**. Since the contradiction between chit and non-chit is shown on account of contradiction between APG-hood and YPG-hood, **P**'s explanation of taking only the chit portion of APG is not in conformity with **B**.

Here, we need to understand the meaning of APG very carefully. When we have a perception of a pot, then the mind goes out to pot and takes the shape of pot. This pot-shaped-mind is called pot-pratyaya. The vishaya of pot-pratyaya is pot. So, pot-pratyaya-vishaya is nothing but pot. Similarly when one sees smoke at a mountain and infers fire, then the mind has no contact with fire and yet it takes the shape of fire within the body. This fire-shaped-mind is called fire-pratyaya. And fire-pratyaya-vishaya is fire.

Now, when we say "I go", "I eat", "I think" etc, then we get aham-pratyaya. What is the vishaya of this aham-pratyaya? Whatever that entity is, that entity must be the kartā of the activities such as going, eating, thinking etc because that is how the entity referred to by aham-pratyaya is expressed.

यदि पुनर्विज्ञानशब्दवाच्या बुद्धिरेव कर्त्री स्यात् , ततः शक्तिविपर्ययः स्यात् — करणशक्तिर्बुद्धेर्हीयेत, कर्तृशक्तिश्चापद्येत ; सत्यां च बुद्धेः #कर्तृशक्तौ, तस्या एव #अहंप्रत्ययविषयत्वमभ्युपगन्तव्यम् ,

अहंकारपूर्विकाया एव प्रवृत्तेः सर्वत्र दर्शनात् — ‘ अहं गच्छामि, अहमागच्छामि, अहं भुञ्जे, अहं पिबामि’ इति च

So, the considered conclusion is — aham-pratyaya-vishaya is nothing but kartA.

Now, question arises, who is kartA. Brahman cannot be kartA because it is nishkriya. ahamkAra cannot be a kartA because it is jada. KartA has to be Chetan. Therefore, the only solution is — sAbhAsa-ahamkAra i.e. ahamkAra-with-reflection-of-Brahman i.e. ahamkAra-with-chidAbhAsa is kartA.

Thus, aham-pratyaya-vishaya = sAbhAsa-ahamkAra = kartA

This is the vAchyA-artha of aham-pratyaya-vishaya.

The lakshya-artha of aham-pratyaya-vishaya is pratyagAtmA which is the sAkshI of kartA i.e. sAbhAsa-ahamkAra i.e. the vAchyA-artha of aham-pratyaya-vishaya. So, lakshya-artha is sAkshI of vAchyA-artha.

How and why is pratyagAtmA the lakshya-artha of aham-pratyaya-vishaya?

Because, it is the PratyagAtma because of which the vAchyA-artha of APG comes to be called as APG. But for PratyagAtma, the vAchyA-artha of APG would have remained as YPG. Hence, truly, it is the PratyagAtma which is the essence of APG and can correctly be referred as lakshya-artha thereof.

So, whenever aham-pratyaya-vishaya is used for pratyagAtmA, it is to be understood that it is its lakshya-artha. To literally take it as aham-pratyaya-vishaya is erroneous because pratyagAtmA is not a vishaya of any pratyaya.

Aham-pratyaya-vishaya and asmat-pratyaya-gochara are one and the same entity. Both vAchya-artha wise and hence lakshya-artha-wise.

Now, B has used the word “अस्मत्प्रत्ययगोचरे विषयिणि चिदात्मके” signifying thereby that the APG is chit-Atmak i.e. chit only (Brhman is sat-Atmak सदात्मक i.e. sat-mAtra सन्मात्र). It is clear therefore that it is not the vAchya-artha of APG which has been taken but it is the lakshya-artha of APG which has been accepted by B here. The vAchya-artha of APG is sAbhAsa-ahamkAra whose distinction from YPG is not at all obvious. In fact, the ahamkAra portion of APG is pretty much YPG. It is only the chit portion of APG whose distinction from YPG is obvious like light and darkness because of mutual anAtmatA.

Therefore, it is apparent that the contradiction between APG and YPG, which is referred to in the first line by referring to the obvious distinction of light and darkness, is through referring to chit and non-chit by taking the lakshya-artha of APG and YPG respectively. Hence, the objection by SSSS does not sustain as to why P has taken only the ‘non-this’ portion in subsequent statement. Because only ‘non-this’ portion was referred to in the causal statement, it is being taken in the resultant statement also. Simple!

Thus, the objection does not hold any force.